DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 972 CS 502 939

AUTHOR Blair, Carole
TITLE Thomas Paine's "Common Sense": A Study in Polarity.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activism; *Colonial History (United States); *Persuasive Discourse; Political Socialization; *Rhetoric; Rhetorical Criticism
IDENTIFIERS *Paine (Thomas)

ABSTRACT

Thomas Paine's "Common Sense," published in 1776, was a significant rhetorical event, having a polarizing effect on a situation marked by confusion and conflicting loyalties, in which prevailing views favored reconciliation of the American colonies with England. Paine's rhetoric intensified the conflict, forcing a cognitive restructuring of the context by placing two opposing forces in wholly contrary positions. Rhetorically, "Common Sense" moved from a discussion of current loyalty affiliations to a denial of those loyalties and through a conflict process in order to achieve the end of independence. Available alternatives were restructured into two mutually opposed options. The subverted group was hyperbolized in strength and motive, forcing a readjustment of power and motives within the opposing affirmed group. All those who were not in support of the affirmed image were relegated to the subverted group and discursively eliminated. (DF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Thomas Paine's Common Sense: A Study in Polarity

Carole Blair

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carole Blair

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper prepared for the
annual convention of the
Speech Communication Association,
November 10--13, 1979,
by Carole Blair
Pennsylvania State University

CS512939

In January, 1776, a pamphlet of anonymous origin, entitled Common Sense, was published in Philadelphia. Thomas Paine, a British emigrant and editor of the Pennsylvania Magazine, was finally identified as its author.[1] Paine attacked the English constitution, denegrated the concept of hereditary monarchy, wrote insultingly of George III, argued that reconciliation was a foolish and futile goal, and urged the colonies to initiate a battle for independence.

The heavily favorable response to the pamphlet in the American colonies was, in some respects, unexplainable.[2] Most of the colonists, although condemning the actions of the British at every juncture, still retained a strong loyalty to the English system of government, and especially to the notion of familial relationship between the King and his subjects.[3] Shortly before Common Sense was published, Paine remarked that the Americans revered the British nation however much they disliked it actions, that their attachment to England was obstinate, and that they regarded the mention of separation as treasonable; their single object was reconciliation.[4]

During this period of avowed loyalty to England, however, armed resistance was the order of the day in several of the colonies. The renowned Lexington and Concord confrontations had already occurred, and military action had continued through the winter of 1775. The leaders in the colonies were escalating the war effort and taking increasingly independent actions; simultaneously, they were arguing for reconciliation. It was a confusing, almost schizophrenic atmosphere.

In light of the situation into which Paine's Common Sense entered, in addition to its remarkable success, the pamphlet constitutes a significant rhetorical event and bears investigation as such. This paper will attempt to identify the ingredients of Common Sense as a polarizing discourse, in order to illustrate the major strategies within the pamphlet and how these strategies contributed to the general air of polarity. Rather than judging the discourse by its objectively-determinable effect, I will make an attempt to explain its success on the basis of its potential as polarizing discourse. A consideration of the polarization phenomenon, however, is necessary initially.

II

King and Anderson utilize two of Fisher's communication motives as the framework for their analysis of polarizing discourse.[5] They define polarization as:

> . . . the process by which an extremely diversified public is coalesced into two or more highly contrasting, mutually exclusive groups, sharing a high degree of internal solidarity in those beliefs which the persuader considers salient.[6]

This divisiveness is created in the contrasting motives of affirmation and subversion which emerge in strategic discursive elements.[7] Fisher explains these motives:

> One can find a rhetoric of affirmation in situations when a communicator addresses potential believers in an effort to get them to adopt a new concept. . . . Subversion. . . occurs in situations in which a communicator attempts to weaken or destroy an ideology.[8]

The rhetor's goal clearly is audience adherence to the affirmed concept. But, the subversive appeals operate conjunctively with the affirmative ones to create an intensified conflict.[9]

This examination of the strategies of polarizing discourse will rely upon the motive basis as King and Anderson and Fisher present it, as well as upon two additional assumptions which can be inferred from general literature on propaganda and specific treatments of polarization. First, polarization will be considered here as the process by which a specific type of political myth is created. Second, that process will be defined as a means to an end, not an end in itself. From these premises, specific strategies may be advanced.

McGee describes "political myth" in this way:

> When "one man stands up as the proclaimer of a general will," what he says, at the time he originally say it, is a fiction, for it is his personal interpretation of his "people's" history. Though he warrants his argument with abundant examples, he creates, not a description of reality, but rather a political myth. . . . Sorel writes: "Myths are not descriptions of things, but expressions of a determination to act. . . ." A myth . . . is at bottom identical with the convictions of a group, being the expression of those convictions in the language of movement. . . . though technically they represent nothing but a "false consciousness," they nonetheless function as a means of providing social unity and collective identity. Indeed, the "people" are the social and political myths they accept.[10]

The rhetor provides a vision of the way in which reality can be conceived, and he asks for a transformation of his myth into an objective social reality. This transformation occurs when the "people" emerge as the objectively real exemplar of the rhetorically-constructed vision. Thus, the political myth consists in the reconstruction of reality as exemplified in the political-social self concept of the audience.

Polarization is a species of this political myth-making. It is, in fact, a nearly perfect example of a fictional vision

which has as its purpose the creation of a "people" or group of adherents exemplifying a given attitude or set of beliefs. Asch describes polarity as a restructuring of the social world in terms of a major issue or set of issues:

> The structuring of the issues produces a new conception of "what makes a difference," which comes close to a change in the patterning of values. Actions and views that ordinarily would be appraised in their own terms are seen exclusively from the standpoint of what matters; all things are colored by their relevance for the major issue.[11]

The myth is not an esoteric construct completely divorced from reality, despite the fact that it is a fiction. Both McGee and Asch acknowledge that it grows from factors in the real situation, most often an ideological crisis. McGee writes:

> So long as the "people" believe basic myths, there is unity and collective identity. When there is no fundamental belief, one senses a crisis which can only be met with a new rhetoric, a new mythology. . . . Because it is a response, not only to discomfort in the environment, but also to the failure of previous myths to cope with such discomfort, a new political myth also conflicts with all previous myths. Each new vision of the collective life, in other words, represents a movement of ideas (and of "the people") from one "world" of attitudes and conditions to another.[12]

Asch explains this crisis in a slightly different way:

> When people are uncertain and threatened, when they are groping and confused, they feel a need for clear, simple explanations that will dispel confusion and provide certainty. . . . Given a condition of crisis the propagandist strives for a radical restructuring by defining one climactic issue or conflict to which he relates all established values. To achieve this he produces by a variety of means a compelling and extremely simplified picture.[13]

Regardless of the way in which the situational crisis factor is explained, it remains that the political myth, the polarizing rhetoric specifically, provides a redefinition of reality, necessitated by the failure of the current objectified view to provide a solution to a perceived crisis situation.

There are two possibilities for the grounding of the political myth, according to McGee:

> . . . There is a constant choice between a "stable" impulse to see objective reality as tending to confirm traditional judgments of life (old myths) and a contrary "vital" impulse to perceive objective reality as tending to refute traditional judgments (a condition calling for new myths).[14]

Thus, the rhetor may provide, in the case of a stable myth, a reaffirmation of traditional or conservative convictions, or he may posit a myth which exemplifies a departure from the social tradition. It may appear, at a superficial level, that any myth, by virtue of its foundation in the inability of traditional mythology to cope with real issues, is vital.[15] However, a myth can be stable in its emphasis on unchanging values, redirected or restructure toward a new end, as Asch points out, in direct reference to propaganda of the polarizing sort:

> In this respect the most violent propaganda is often most conservative. It calls for a reaffirmation of tradition, reestablishment of an order that has existed in the past in a presumably pure form, a return to the faith of one's fathers.[16]

Thus, polarizing rhetoric, viewed as a strategy contributing to political myth, provides a reconstruction of social reality, born of a situational exigence of some sort, which seeks a "people" to embody it, and which can be posited by either vital or stable forces within the social field.

In addition to its identification as a political myth-making enterprise, polarization should be viewed as a means directed toward an extrinsic purpose. Though most political myths have an intrinsic purpose of creating a "people" or an embodiment of the myth, polarization seeks that end only

as an intermediate step in the achievement of an objective which lies beyond the coming-to-be of the "people." Division for its own sake is pointless; unless the dissonant features of the new myth of polarity are resolved in some way, the social world will remain in disequilibrium.

Such a conception of polarization admittedly seems paradoxical if viewed in terms of the duality which characterizes it. To the extent that the rhetor attempts to set off mutually exclusive groups in affirmative and subversive categories, and because that structuring constitutes the myth, it might be difficult to determine the exact character of the rhetor's purpose. However, if affirmation and subversion are conceived as motives, and if polarization is considered as a single-purpose, rather than dual-purpose mode of discourse, the concept become more tenable.

Fisher characterized affirmation and subversion as motives, which he describes as "names which essentialize the interrelations of communicator, communication, audience(s), time, and place."[17] These single motives which denote interrelationships may display interrelationships between and among one another. Fisher notes this in the combination of affirmation and subversion:

> It is important to note a nice relationship between affirmative and subversive rhetorics: to affirm an image is, in effect, to subvert an old one; to subvert an old one is, in effect, to affirm a new one. In other words, in life there is death, in death there is life. Elements of both motives may exist in a single communication, and certainly exist in a persuasive campaign or movement, but one motive will tend to dominate in any given rhetorical situation.[18]

In addition to the relationship of affirmation and subversion,

Fisher notes importantly that there is a dominant motive present in the combination, which is indicative of the single, myth-extrinsic purpose.

The unique character of polarization as myth becomes obvious in terms of its purpose. The ratification of a myth, according to McGee, occurs when "the people" reject other competing myths and accept it as their self conceptualization. In the polarization myth, the same process occurs; however, "the people" of the affirmed image must achieve a goal beyond their own actualization. The "people must extinguish the counterpart "enemy," embodied in the subverted image which is also created by the myth. That is the overriding, yet extrinsic purpose of polarization, and it is characterized by affirmative motive dominance.[19]

With this general overview in mind, it is possible to generate some definitive strategies of polarizing rhetoric. The first of these is the hyperbolic excoriation of the "enemy," or subverted image. While exaggeration, monolithic opposition, and devil-terms have been isolated as characteristic of polarization discourse, their interdependence has been overlooked.[20] Polarity in rhetorical discourse is not dissimilar to magnetic polarity; the forces must be opposing and equivalent. Thus, the rhetor must hyperbolize the motive image of the subverted group in order to request an equal and opposite display of strength from the affirmed "people." He/she must emphasize the strength and threat represented by the subversion motive. The "enemy" must be presented as a force which is representative of evil and which consciously intends mischief to the affirmative image and its values; the strength and intent of

the subversive element cannot be minimized in any way.

Balancing the hyperbolic excoriation is the celebration of the affirmative motive. The values of the mythically affirmed "people" are placed in direct antithesis to those which are present in the subverted image. The rhetor often presents the affirmative "people" as victims of the "enemy," but emphasizes that, with a positive effort from the "people," right will triumph. The celebratory images are both epideictic and exhortative, praising those things which the "people" represent, and at the same time, urging them to action. Hyperbolic excoriation and affirmative celebration are separated here only for analysis; they operate conjunctively within the larger frame of artificial dichotomization, which Raum and Measell describe:

> Perhaps the most basic copula tactic is the drawing of artificial dichotomies. . . . The tactic itself is most explicit; the speaker openly states that only two alternatives can be chosen by the auditor on a given issue. In reality, however, other options do exist. It is the reduction of a many-faceted situation to two diametrically opposed alternatives that creates polarization.[21]

The presence of a dichotomy clearly is synonymous with polarity; the important feature here is the artificiality. No middle ground is open in the dichotomy; an either-or choice is forced:

> The trend to simplicity can produce results that are contrary to the demands of clear thinking. Exploitative propaganda takes advantage of these trends and intensifies them; instead of warning people about the hazards to clear-sightedness, it fosters confusion by endowing its explanation with the character of simplicity. . . . This "polarization by antithesis" consists in creating two regions in the social world: good and evil. It fuses all cherished values and groups into one indivisible whole and to define an equally monolithic opposition as the negation of the whole.[22]

Bowers and Ochs advance a component of this dichotomy in their

statement that polarizing rhetoric assigns the uncommitted to the enemy camp.[23] There are only two choices made available within the polarization myth.

The "people" are infused with the myth-intrinsic intent of coming-to-be in order to achieve the extrinsic purpose, that of disposal or removal of the subversive image. According to Asch,

> Even more striking is the quality which "they," the opposing side, acquires. To it attaches a quality of inherent evil; it is a source of infection contaminating all that it touches. It is then easy to conclude that no resolution other than extermination is possible; the world can return to peace and tranquility only if the source of impurity is extirpated.[24]

While Asch's description connotes violence of some sort, that is not always the case. The subversion motive must be separated or destroyed and the enemy image must be obliterated, but violence committed against real people is not always necessitated. Such is the case within the fiction presented by the myth. There may be a symbolic extermination instead of a physical one.

These elements constitute the polarization myth. The polarity occurs symbolically within the discourse, and the rhetor seeks to objectify the myth through the "people." It is important, then, to determine the nature of the restructuring as it occurs in the process of myth construction, within the discourse itself, to understand the effectiveness of the myth. That will be the primary consideration in analyzing Common Sense.

III

The interdependence of motives in Paine's discourse is

obvious in his descriptions of the "people" and their counterpart "enemy." He described the affirmative image in this way:

> We are already greater than the King wishes us to be, and will he not hereafter endeavour to make us less. To bring the matter to one point, is the power who is jealous of our prosperity, a proper power to govern us? Whoever says no to this question is an Independant, for independency means no more than whether we shall make our own laws, or, whether the King, the greatest enemy this Continent hath, or can have, shall tell us, there shall be no laws but such as I like.[25]

It is noteworthy that much of the identity definition throughout Common Sense was negative; Paine was simultaneously defining affirmative and subversive images. The affirmative "people" was that which the "enemy" was not, and the "enemy" was that which the "people" were not.

Paine's "enemy" or subverted image was alternately the policy of reconciliation and George III:

> I am inclined to believe, that all those who espouse the doctrine of reconciliation, may be included within the following descriptions. Interested men who are not to be trusted, weak men who cannot see, prejudiced men who will not see, and a certain set of moderate men who think better of the European world than it deserves; and this last class, by an ill-judged deliberation, will be the cause of more calamities to this Continent, than all the other three. . . . that reconciliation now is a dangerous doctrine, I affirm, that it would be policy in the King, at this time, to repeal the acts for the sake of reinstating himself in the government of the provinces; In order that he may accomplish by craft and subtilty, in the long run, what he cannot do by force and violence in the short one. Reconciliation and ruin are nearly related.[26]

Thus, the subverted group consisted of the British government in addition to those who favored reconciliation. Paine referred to the King as an "inveterate enemy to liberty," and argued that England's interest would naturally suppress the colonies.[27] In addition, the English, in Paine's view, had set about conspiring against the colonies by "stirring up the Indians and

Negroes" to destructive intent.[28] References were made to "popery," "original sin," "the Devil," and "idolatry," as the guiding principles of monarchy and specifically of George III.[29] England and her supporters were the threatening forces to be overcome.

These threatening forces were ones possessed of evil motives, as Paine portrayed them. And the motives clearly were hyperbolized in terms of the threat factor. Although it is true that Great Britain was seeking her own interests, it is not clear that those interests were wholly at odds with those of the colonies. The conspiratorial theme, to the extent that it described England as evil in and of itself, and as harboring ill intent toward the colonies, served an important function for Paine's purpose. It provided the symbolic negative "pole," the repellant force against which the colonists would unite. For an affirmative response to be viable, the potential thereof must be perceived and actualized as equal and opposite. In that respect, it is not surprising that Paine defined the groups in terms of each other.

It should be noted also that Paine's system was mythical in the sense described previously. Notable was the criticism of the entire British governmental system and the attack on monarchy in the large. These were issues which were only indirectly related to the British-American conflict; in fact, they could only be brought to bear upon the dispute if the total viewpoint of the colonists was to be restructured. Paine's apparent intent was to supplant the quasi-positive view of Britain with a wholly negative one, and a new mythology was required for that end.

Paine's new mythology of division was characterized by an artificiality in worldview. The situation in 1776, as indicated previously, was one of dual loyalty and confusion of values. Although the possibilities for solution in this situation were endless, Paine described only two possible options, "slavery" and "independence:" an open fight for separation was the only alternative to total submission to to England.[30] In thus identifying the conflicting elements, Paine created the intrinsic purpose of the myth. The mere coming-to-be of the "people" would represent the initial goal, simply because the existence of that "people" definitionally signified conflict.

The extrinsic purpose was actually presented as a secondary myth, the transfer of power from George III to a new American "people." The ultimate objective for Paine was the establishment of an independent America, possible only through a removal of the influence of the Crown:

> But where say some is the King of America? I'll tell you friend, he reigns above; and doth not make havoc of mankind like the Royal Brute of Great Britain. Yet that we may not appear to be defective even in earthly honours, let a day be solemnly set a part for proclaiming the Charter; let it be brought forth placed on the Divine Law, the Word of God; let a crown be placed thereon, by which the world may know, that as far as we approve of monarchy, that in America the law is king. For as in absolute governments the King is law, so in free countries the law ought to be king; and there ought to be no other. But lest any ill use should hereafter arise, let the Crown at the end of the ceremony be demolished, and scattered among the people whose right it is.[31]

According to Jordan, this passage was more than a removal of the King's influence in America. It was a symbolic "patricide:"

> Placement of a crown, the emblem of kingship upon the charter of fundamental law imparts to the charter the king's power, his sovereignty. But this transfer

> is, as Paine says, dangerously insufficient. The crown, the king, must be "demolished." How? By breaking the crown, the king, into pieces--pieces which must be distributed among the people in order that they may acquire his power. The king is dead; his power is in the people.[32]

If actual polarity was Paine's intrinsic goal, there was no option for the extrinsic goal but the emblematic murder. The obstacle to the ultimate objective, the Crown had to be obliterated. With the exception of this passage, most of the explicit references for the secondary myth were ones of expedience. Paine argued that America had the natural resources as well as the will to create an independent, republican America.[33]

IV

Paine entered upon a situation marked by confusion and conflicting loyalties, a situation in which the prevailing support was rendered in favor of a compromise conciliatory policy. Paine intensified the conflict, forcing a cognitive redefinition or restructuring of the context by placing two opposing forces in wholly contrary positions, thereby creating a scenario in which the British were removed permanently from the colonies. The secondary myth of American independence and self-government, then, could be advanced as the new "world."

Consideration of Paine's Common Sense in terms of the polarity concept illuminates the nature of the discourse as well as the functional structure of polarization as it is exemplified in this particular case. The essence of the pamphlet, above all, is not a static one. Paine progressively moved from a discussion of the historical origins of the

salient value structures, through the creation and denigration of the suverted image, through the ratification of the affirmed image, and finally to the emergence of the extrinsic purpose, in the form of the secondary myth. The process was from current loyalty affiliations, to a denial of those loyalties, and through a conflict or revolutionary process in order to achieve the end of independence.

Paine restructured available alternatives into two mutually opposed options. The subverted group was hyperbolized in terms of strength as well as motives, forcing a readjustment of power and motives within the opposing affirmed group. All those who could/would not support the affirmed image were relegated to the subverted group. Because that group was obstructive to the affirmative image, it was discursively exterminated.

Paine later clarified his reasons for writing his pamphlet, perhaps somewhat modestly:

> There is existing in man, a mass of sense lying in a dormant state and which, unless something excites it to action will descend with him, in that condition to the grave. . . . I saw an opportunity, in which I thought I could do some good, and I followed what my heart dictated. . . . On these principles I published the pamphlet Common Sense.[34]

Common Sense was an immediate success. However, even aside from the impact of the pamphlet, Common Sense remains a masterpiece of polarizing strategy, motive juxtaposition, and value restructuring.

Notes

[1]See Samuel Edwards, Rebel! A Biography of Thomas Paine (N. Y.: Praeger Press, 1974), p. 35. Great care was taken to keep the author's identity secret. The discovery of the authorship occurred too late to become a significant deterrent to the impact of the pamphlet, but certain of the loyalists did argue that Paine should be ignored because he was nothing but a meddling foreigner.

[2]Approximately 120,000 copies of the pamphlet were sold in the three months following the publication of Common Sense. Many who were illiterate had the pamphlet read to them. See Eric Foner, Tom Paine and Revolutionary America (N. Y.: Oxford University Press, 1976), p. 79.

[3]See Winthrop Jordan, "Familial Politics: Thomas Paine and the Killing of the King, 1776," Journal of American History, 60 (Sept., 1973), 294.

[4]Thomas Paine, Writings, ed. by Moncure D. Conway, volume I, (N.Y.: N. p., 1894), pp. 69-80.

[5]Andrew A. King and Floyd Douglas Anderson, "Nixon, Agnew, and the 'Silent Majority:' A Case Study in the Rhetoric of Polarization," WS, 35 (Fall, 1971), 243-255; Walter Fisher, "A Motive View of Communication," QJS, 56 (Apr., 1970), 131-139.

[6]King and Anderson, p. 244.

[7]King and Anderson simply characterize affirmation and subversion as techniques. In order to remain true to Fisher's text, they will be considered as motives exemplified through techniques. Also see note #18.

[8]Fisher, pp. 132, 137. Compare the rhetorics of assent and negation which characterize social movements in Leland Griffin, "A Dramatistic Theory of the Rhetoric of Movements," in Critical Responses to Kenneth Burke, ed. by William P. Rueckert, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969), pp. 456-479.

[9]See Ladd Wheeler, Edward Deci, Harry Reis, and Miron Zuckerman, Interpersonal Influence, 2d. ed., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978), pp. 77-86.

[10]Michael C. McGee, "In Search of 'The People:' A Rhetorical Alternative," QJS, 61 (Oct., 1975), 240-241, 244, 247.

[11]Solomon Asch, Social Psychology (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1952), p. 632.

[12]McGee, p. 245.

[13]Asch, pp. 629-630.

[14]McGee, p. 246.

[15]Bowers and Ochs argue, relatedly, that polarization is a vital element in that it is a strategy of agitation. See John Waite Bowers and Donovan J. Ochs, The Rhetoric of Agitation and Control (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1971), pp. 17-20. Cathcart argues, however, and I think, correctly, that the establishment also often utilizes "polarization and radical division" as a response to crisis. Robert S. Cathcart, "Movements," SSCJ, 43 (1978), 246. Much more in-depth analysis of the use of polarizing rhetoric by stable or establishment institutions may be found in two other papers: David Humphrey, "Pentadic Analysis of Polarization Strategies: A Method for the Dramatistic Study of Social Movements," unpublished paper, The University of Iowa, 1978; and Martin Pearson, "The Boston Massacre Orations: Healing and Polarizing," unpublished manuscript, The University of Iowa, 1978.

[16]Asch, p. 630.

[17]Fisher, p. 132.

[18]Ibid., pp. 138-139. To consider affirmation and subversion as separable "strategies" as King and Anderson did, is to ignore the fundamental interrelationships which reside in the complementary nature of the two motives. It is to ignore also the wholistic nature of polarization. The essence of polarization is division, and that division is exemplified better by motivational interrelationships than by two individual "strategies." While the motive signifiers may be separated for analysis, the overall purpose must not be overlooked.

[19]There are two noteworthy considerations here. First, the subverted "enemy" does not have to be extinguished in any physically violent sense, but the threat to the affirmative "people" posed by the subversion motive must be eliminated in some way. Second, the notion of motive-dominance and the singularity of purpose provides another justification for viewing affirmative and subversive rhetorics as motives rather than strategies. A rhetor conceiveably could construct a situation in which affirmation was the dominant motive but for which there were more explicit and identifiable subversion strategies.

[20]These three strategies, isolated by Raum and Measell, together constitute the category advocated here. See Richard D. Raum and James S. Measell, "Wallace and His Ways: A Study of the Rhetorical Genre of Polarization," CSSJ, 25 (Spring, 1974), 28-35. A treatment of the use of hyperbole in discourse can be found in Michael C. Leff, "Redemptive Identification: Cicero's Catalinarian Orations," in Explorations in Rhetorical Criticism, ed. by Charles J. Stewart, Donovan J. Ochs, and G. P. Mohrmann, (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1973), pp. 158-177. The synthesis of these strategies is indicative of the dual-motive, single-purpose character of polarization.

[21]Raum and Measell, p. 31. See also William V. Haney, Communication: Patterns and Incidents (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, 1960), p. 123. Haney defines polarization by the artificiality of the distinction: "Polarization occurs when one treats contraries as if they were contradictories; when one deals with a situation involving gradations and middle ground in strict, either-or contradictory terms."

[22]Asch, pp. 629-630. (Sic)

[23]Bowers and Ochs, p. 21.

[24]Asch, p. 631.

[25]Paine, "Common Sense" in Tracts of the American Revolution, 1763-1776, ed. by Merrill Jensen, (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967), p. 429.

[26]Ibid., pp. 424,430.

[27]Ibid., pp. 428-430.

[28]Ibid., p. 435.

[29]Ibid., pp. 409, 413,415.

[30]Ibid., p. 429.

[31]Ibid., p. 434.

[32]Jordan, p. 298.

[33]Paine, "Common Sense," pp. 431-444.

[34]Paine, quoted by Nelson Adkins, introduction to "Common Sense" and Other Writings, ed. by Adkins, (N.Y.: Liberal Arts Press, 1953), pp. xix-xx.